

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

13 NEIL B. STAFFORD,

Civil No. 06-3007-CO  
O R D E R

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 MARIE HILL, ET. AL.,

17 Defendants.  
18

---

19 AIKEN, Judge:

20 Magistrate Judge Cooney filed his Findings and  
21 Recommendation on June 9, 2006. The matter is now before me  
22 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).  
23 When a party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's Findings  
24 and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo  
25 determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report. 28  
26 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore  
27 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert.  
28 denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

1 Plaintiff has timely filed objections. I have, therefore,  
2 given the file of this case a de novo review. I ADOPT the  
3 Magistrate's Findings and Recommendation (doc. 26) that  
4 defendants' motion for summary judgment (doc. 11) is granted and  
5 this case is dismissed with prejudice.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7  
8 Dated this 19 day of July 2006.

9  
10  
11  
12 /s/ Ann Aiken  
13 Ann Aiken  
14 United States District Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28